

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended to further clarify the features of these claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

More specifically, claim 1 recites “converting information formed by said creating and assigning into a first document formulated in a page description language, the first document containing first references to corresponding configured objects being associated with at least one of the functions blocks, and into a second document formulated in the page description language, and the second document containing second references to corresponding function blocks being associated with at least one of the configured objects.” By converting the information concerning physical objects of the electrical system into two separate documents formulated in a page description language (for example, HTML or XML), claim 1 provides a transformation and, therefore, is directed to statutory subject matter. Furthermore, the Examiner’s contention that the claim steps can be performed using a pen/pencil and paper is incorrect, as it is respectfully submitted that the step of converting information into a document in a page description language cannot be performed using only a pen/pencil and paper.

Likewise, claim 4 has been amended to recite “generating a graph from sets of representations of physical objects of the electrical system, the sets of representation being of node function blocks and connection function blocks of the electrical system, the graph having only nodes corresponding to the node function blocks and references to the nodes” and claim 8 has been amended to recite “generating a first document in a page description language referring to configured objects and a second document in the page description language referring to function blocks using the mapping.”

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-7 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended in response to this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

More specifically, claims 1 and 4 each provide for displaying information (either first and second documents or a graph) that include information relating to physical objects of the electrical system, thus representing a configuration of the electrical system.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-12-09

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501